

REMARKS

Status of the Application

Claims 1-25 were pending and are subject to a two-way restriction requirement. By way of this amendment, claims 15, 17, 18, 20, 21 and 23 are amended and new claim 26 is added. Thus, claims 1-26 are now pending.

Restriction Requirement

Applicants respectfully traverse the restriction requirement.

The Office Action alleges that there are two inventions subject to a restriction requirement: invention I corresponding to claims 1-14 and 25, and invention II corresponding to claims 15-24.

M.P.E.P. § 808 sets forth the Examiner's burden when making a restriction requirement. It states that the restriction requirement must establish two things: 1) "the reasons why each invention *as claimed* is either independent or distinct from the other(s);'" (emphasis in original) and 2) "the reasons why there would be a serious burden on the Examiner if restriction is not required." With respect to the second requirement, the Office Action states "there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions have acquired separate status in the art in view of their different classification." Office Action at p. 3. Further, the Office Action alleges that claims 15-24 are drawn to a bonus game, which is a different classification than that of claims 1-14 and 25.

Applicants respectfully traverse the assertion that claims 15-24 are drawn to a bonus game and should be classified separately from claims 1-14 and 25. Thus, the Examiner failed to establish reasons why there would be a serious burden if the restriction is not required. Moreover, claims 15, 17, 18, 20, 21 and 23 have been amended to delete the word "bonus". Thus, it is now clear that claims 15-24 should not be classified differently as being drawn to a bonus game and no serious burden will result if claims 15-24 are examined along with claims 1-14 and 25. Withdrawal of the restriction requirement is respectfully requested.

Application No. 10/603,877
Amendment dated March 8, 2007
Reply to Office Action of December 8, 2006

Docket No.: 29757/P-828

Nonetheless, in order to satisfy the requirement under 37 CFR 1.143,
Applicants provisionally elect alleged invention I, corresponding to claims 1-14 and 25.


The amendments of claims 15, 17, 18, 20, 21 and 23 are not narrowing and
were not made for reasons of patentability.

Conclusion

Applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: March 8, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Gregory E. Stanton

Registration No.: 45,127
MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP
233 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 6300
Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6357
(312) 474-6300
Attorney for Applicant